

SPEECH

OF THE

HON. JOHN ROLPH,

ON THE

CLERGY RESERVE QUESTION,

SEPTEMBER, 1852.

(From the Quebec Gazette, Sept. 22d, 1852.)

Dr. ROLPH said—He had hoped that the hon. member for Kent would have been sufficiently inspired by the question under debate, to consider it with sobriety and truth. But under the evil spirit which had haunted him thus far through the Session, he had distilled from the *Globe* and kindred journals all the venom he could find; and having seemingly in some degree poisoned the mind of his honorable and patriotic friend the member for Two Mountains (Mr. Papineau,) he (the hon. member for Kent) had hoped with such an ally to annihilate the Government. Collecting from newspaper scraps all the political scandal and party vituperation which the last few years had produced, he had, without any honest discrimination of truth from falsehood, hurled the heterogeneous mass against the Government with a random and desperate chance of effecting a ministerial discomfiture. Lost to the love of liberty, civil and religious, which had ever characterized his countrymen, he had preferred the subject of personal invective, to the high and constitutional question, which is the only one for debate. But as he (Dr. Rolph) had not risen to join issue with the unworthy attacks upon the members of the party and the Government they sustain, he should take his leave of the hon. member for the present; and while discussing the repeal of the 3 & 4 Vic., under which their constitutional power had been wrongfully strangled, he might occasionally pay his respects to him again. We once had the power, the recognized power, of legislating upon the Clergy Reserves, upon the funds arising from them, and upon their bearing on the religion and cherishes of the country; and over any legislation connected with the subject. This power was intimately connected with the peace, welfare, and good government of the country; for the attainment of which great ends our constitution had been bestowed upon us. This power had, however, been taken from us by the 3 & 4 Vic., ch. 78. And we, therefore, by the resolutions before the House, seek for its repeal. This course, among others open to our choice, seems, under existing circumstances, the most judicious, and promises to be the most successful. It must be borne in mind that we have not only to contend with difficulties in our domestic arena, but with distant and very perplexing obstructions in Great Britain; where, indeed, none should exist, but where, lately they have, it must be admitted, very much increased. And our efforts and appeal will be enfeebled or strengthened, defeated or consummated, according to the particular course we may pursue at this particular juncture and under the present state of the question. There is one point upon which we all agree; that the right to legislate upon the subject constitutionally, belongs to us; and cannot be rightfully withheld from us. It is possible, most assuredly, for us to take several different courses. We may determine first what we desire, and then ask for its confirmation—or we may ask the British Parliament to think and do for us in the matter, instead of thinking and doing for ourselves—or we may claim at once, as freemen, the right of free domestic legislation. If we present our views for ratification, we necessarily

provoke at this critical juncture, a discussion, a hostile discussion, upon our domestic religious differences, embracing the whole question of ecclesiastical establishments and endowments. It forces upon the British Parliament discussion and adjudication upon affairs strictly local and domestic. If we ask them to think and do for us, we surrender our constitutional power, and our discretion into the bargain—a power and a discretion which the people have delegated to us, and which we have no right to delegate to others. But if we ask for our own appropriate power upon high constitutional grounds, we ask for what they know they ought to give, and what we are entitled to receive.—If the power should be unsatisfactorily exercised by us, the British Parliament are not to blame. They have done their duty by an act of constitutional justice, in placing a domestic matter at our constitutional disposal. But we ought not, as a matter of choice, to ask them to carry out a policy they may disapprove or which might needlessly expose them to parliamentary or other embarrassments, embarrassments too, which must operate directly against ourselves.—They might, under their prepossession, say, do your wicked work for yourselves. It is one thing to give a man his rightful discretionary powers, for the application of which you are not responsible; it is another thing to volunteer or consent to carry out for him just what questionable matters he may choose to require. Now we do not ask them to do or confirm our work, good, bad, or indifferent; we only say, unite our hands, and we will do it for ourselves. Again—If we ask for the repeal of the 3 & 4 Vic. cap. 78, we ask from Earl Derby what Earl Grey has already promised, instead of asking what may be refused, because it has not been before asked and promised. We have made a proposition. It has been substantially assented to. The right course now is to call for the embodiment of that assent in the promised measure. We shall, in that case, be entitled to the support of Earl Grey in the House of Lords, and of his late colleagues who may be in the House of Commons. To retain and deserve their support may insure a victory; to lose it, by the mistaken abandonment of a recognized course, may be certain defeat. We ask, therefore, for this act of justice, because Earl Grey has promised it, emphatically promised it. He says:—"You will further inform the House, that while Her Majesty's servants recognize that a subject of so much difficulty as that of the Clergy Reserves should, after an interval of some years, have again been brought under discussion, it has appeared to them on mature deliberation, that the desire expressed by the assembly in this address ought to be acceded to, and they will accordingly be prepared to recommend to parliament that an act should be passed giving the provincial legislatures full authority to make such alterations as they may think fit in the existing arrangements with regard to the Clergy Reserves, provided that existing interests are respected. In coming to this conclusion Her Majesty's government have been mainly influenced by the consideration that great as would, in their judgment, be the advantages which would result from leaving undisturbed the existing arrangement by which a certain portion of the public lands of Canada are made available for

the purpose of creating a fund for the religious instruction of the inhabitants of the Province, still, the question whether that arrangement is to be maintained or altered, is one so exclusively affecting the people of Canada that its decision ought not to be withdrawn from the Provincial Legislature, to which it properly belongs, to regulate all matters concerning the domestic interests of the Province. It has therefore appeared to Her Majesty's government that it would be impossible for them consistently with the principles on which they have always held that the government of Canada ought to be conducted, to advise Her Majesty to refuse to comply with the prayer of the address of the House of Assembly." Such are the assurances of Earl Grey, and the high constitutional principles on which they are given. We ask for the repeal on this further ground, that our past colonial bills, instead of being ratified, were disallowed; and that disallowance was a virtual reference to us of the question again. In 1840 under the administration of P. Thompson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, a bill was passed by the Canadian parliament intended for the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question, and transmitted to England. It was disallowed.

—The British parliament might have assumed to pass a law to give validity to this bill of 1840. It would have confirmed the seeming wishes of the people, however justly abortive and disastrous it might have proved in the end. The bill, though void, was a guide to the British parliament; and those who furnished the guide, all things being in good faith, could not complain of its being followed. Under a sincere desire to realize the expressed desires of the country, we should naturally expect this opportunity earnestly sought to embody that expression in a British act, if British action in the case was deemed justifiable at all. It would have stamped sincerely perhaps, on a profusion of promises through a course of years, always to fulfil the pleasure of the Colonists. This course, however, was avoided. The invalid bill, instead of being converted, by the transforming influence of the British Senate, into a valid law, was formally disallowed. The moment this bill, seemingly consummated in this country by mystic agencies, was disallowed, we were restored to the position we occupied before the bill was passed. Had things so remained, we might now legislate as freely as ever; and it might be fairly presumed, till the contrary appeared, that the disallowance was intended to again transfer the matter to the constitutional action of the colonial parliament.

—The justice of this expectation is verified by numerous despatches—extracts from some of which, he would read to the House. Lord Glenelg, in 1856, addresses himself thus to Sir F. B. Head:—

"Your predecessor and the Council agree in the opinion, that it is vain to expect the concurrence of the two branches of the local legislature in any adjustment of this question, and they therefore invoke the interposition of Parliament; which interposition the Assembly, on the other hand, deprecate with equal earnestness.

"The chief practical question, then, which at present demands consideration, is whether His Majesty should be advised to recommend to Parliament the assumption to itself of the office of deciding on the future appropriation of these lands."

From this course His Lordship decidedly dissents, and remarks:—

"In referring the subject to the future Canadian Legislature, the authors of the constitutional Act must be supposed to have contemplated the crisis at which we have now arrived—the era of warm and protracted debate, which in a free government may be said to be a necessary precursor to the settlement of any great principle of national policy. We must not have recourse to an extreme remedy, merely to avoid the embarrassment which is the present though temporary result of our own deliberate legislation.

"I think, therefore, that to withdraw from the Canadian to the Imperial Legislature the question respecting the Clergy Reserves, would be an infringement of that cardinal principle of colonial government which forbids Parliamentary interferences, except in submission to an evident and well established necessity.

"Without expressing any further opinion as

present on the general objects of the Bill of last session, I think the effect of that Bill would, as it appears, have been to constitute the Assembly not merely the arbiters respecting the disposal of the funds to be raised by the sale of these lands, but the active and independent agents in effecting those sales, and thus to invest them with the appropriate functions of the executive government."

Again His Lordship remarks:—

"Until every prospect of adjusting this dispute within the Province itself shall have been distinctly exhausted, the time for the interposition of Parliament will not have arrived, unless, indeed, both Houses shall concur in soliciting that interposition; in which event there would of course be an end to the constitutional objections already noticed."

And again:—

"I think myself bound to abstain from advising His Majesty to refer this question immediately to Parliament, because the authors of the Constitutional Act have declared this to be one of those subjects, in regard to which the initiative is expressly reserved and recognised as falling within the peculiar province and the special cognisance of the local legislature."

The country under these circumstances had grounds for entertaining the highest assurance of their constitutional safety; and when the bill of 1840 was disallowed, the reference of the subject matter to our own Legislature, seemed the only course consistent with official pledges, too numerous to be forgotten, and too sacred (one hopes) to be violated. But in the face of all these official protestations, the bill of 1840, having been disallowed, the further legislation was retained in England, and the 3rd & 4th Vic. cap. 78 was substituted—the product of a transatlantic assumption of an irresponsible authority. We ask for its repeal, therefore, because it unconsciously superseded the reference of the question back to the people of Canada. Again, we ask for the repeal on this further ground; that 3 has by its provisions outraged public opinion, and even outraged the Canadian bill of 1840. It rivalled it in that policy of pensioning churches and their ministers, against which we had entered so many solemn protests; and these protests had been respected and sanctioned by official correspondence.

—The following extract from a despatch of Lord Sydenham, discloses the existence of mysterious agencies in the passage of our bill of 1840, and candidly tells the colonial minister how outrageously it violated public sentiment:—

"I will not conceal, however, from your Lordship that even to this Bill, thus proceeding on the principle of permanent distribution among different religious communities, nearly insuperable objections have been and are entertained in this Province. For many years past the Representatives of the people have uniformly refused to assent to an appropriation of this Fund for religious purposes at all, and have steadily maintained its distribution to educational or State purposes; and it is only a strong desire which is entertained of coming now to a settlement which has led many, who formerly advocated these opinions with success, now to withdraw their opposition, and to assent to this measure. But I can safely say, that so far as this Province is concerned, their assent can never again be looked for. I entertain no doubt that the course taken by many members of the Assembly in their conscientious and most laudable desire to put this question at rest, will occasion great opposition to their return at the next election; and I am satisfied that, in a future Assembly, if the matter were unfortunately again brought before it, it would not be possible to obtain any such terms for the Established Church or for religious instruction."—Despatch to Lord John Russell, Jan. 22, 1840.

Lord Glenelg had, under previous administrations, recognised public opinion in Canada as the basis of any settlement. His Lordship, in 1857, declared:—

"That he could not venture to prescribe to the Legislatures of the Canadian Provinces the principles on which they should endeavour to make provision for the religious wants of their fellow colonists." And when he did afterwards (Dec. 1857) venture the statement that "the contributions of the State towards the support of the different christian communities should be regulated by the extent of the voluntary efforts which the members of each should make for

the promotion of the same general end;" and suggested that the Reserves should be converted into a fund subject to this mode of distribution; he directed the Under-Secretary, only three days after, to state that "Lord Glenelg would distinctly decline, on the part of His Majesty's Government, the wish or the intention to insist on any such condition as an indispensable preliminary to an adjustment of the question;" adding, "that such an interference on the part of Government with the Provincial Legislature, would, as his Lordship apprehends, tend to create a not unreasonable suspicion of the sincerity with which the Legislature have been invited to the exercise of the power reserved to them on this subject by the Constitutional Act of 1791."

And again:—

"With respect," he says, "to the charge of showing undue preference to the teachers of religion belonging to the established Church of this country, it is so utterly at variance with the whole course of policy which it has been the object of my despatches to yourself (Sir J. Colborne) to prescribe, that I cannot pause to repel it in any formal manner. . . . His Majesty has studiously abstained from endowing Herby or other corporations, until he should obtain the advice of the Representatives of the Canadian people for his guidance."

Indeed Lord Glenelg goes the whole length of complying with the public wish for the secularization of the Reserves. He says:—

"It is sufficient to repeat that His Majesty's Government have advised the abandonment of the Reserves, for the simple reason, that after an experience of forty years they have been found not to answer the expectations entertained at the time the system was established, but have entailed a heavy burden upon the province without producing any corresponding advantage."

In another despatch of the same date, Lord Glenelg unfolding, in detail, his scheme for the abrogation of the Reserves, gives instructions for the repeal by the Upper Canada Legislature of those clauses of the Constitutional Act which relate to the allotment and appropriation of lands for the support of a Protestant Clergy, and observes:—

"That to remove all doubts as to the effect of the repeal, it should be expressly provided that the reserved lands should immediately vest in His Majesty, and be held by him, his heirs, and successors, in the same manner in every respect as if the provisions to be repealed had never been enacted."

But with a distinct knowledge of this inveterate opinion in the colony on the subject, and with a distinct knowledge of the way in which the Bill of 1840 had been carried, and, assuredly with a distinct recollection of the policy that had been avowed, and the assurances of sincerity that had been made, the British Government carried through Parliament a measure by which the churches of England and Scotland, comprising at the time about one-third of the population—were assigned about three-fourths of the Clergy Reserves, the remaining fraction being offered to the dissenting churches, or "heretical churches, or the schismatic churches, or by whatever other name you may choose to call them, as unworthy of an equitable division of the spoil. We, therefore, ask for the repeal of this law, as doing violence to the acknowledged public opinion of the country, and subversive of the good faith pledged by numerous despatches. We still further asked for its repeal, because it is unconstitutional; so much so as our bill of 1840, which was on that very ground disallowed—and on that ground we hope they will now disallow their own.—Let us glance at the official opinion of Lord Glenelg, Lord John Russell and the crown officers.

Lord John Russell in a despatch from which he (Mr. Rolph) quoted, after advertising to a difficulty from delay in transmitting the bill of 1840, says:—

"But had this difficulty not arisen, there were other motives which would have effectually prevented the acceptance of this measure by Her Majesty. Parliament delegated to the local legislature the right of appointing the clergy reserves, and the effect of the bill is to re-transfer this duty from the local legislature to Parliament, with a particular

restriction. I am advised by the law officers of the Crown that this is an unconstitutional proceeding. It is certainly unusual and inconvenient. Her Majesty cannot assume that Parliament will accept this delegated office."

Lord Glenelg was of the same opinion, saying, that "Parliamentary legislation on any subject of exclusively internal concern, in any British colony possessing a representative assembly, is as a general rule, unconstitutional. It is a right of which the exercise is reserved for extreme cases, in which necessity at once creates and justifies the exception."

Thus his Lordship not only states the unconstitutionality, but the reason of it. The language of these noble Lords goes the length of declaring that it is unconstitutional for the British Parliament to usurp a Legislative power which they have delegated to a colonial Parliament. The surrender of the power is an estoppel to a reclaim of it. If used in an extreme case, sufficiently extreme, as Lord Glenelg observes, "at once to create and justify the exception," it would be an act under the law of necessity superseding for the time, the law of the land. It would be analogous to the bombardment of Copenhagen and the seizure of the fleet. When passing events any where dethrone the majesty of the law, the law of nations interposes.—This was the dimly pretext for Napoleon's late visit to Rome. The case before us comprehends the gift of a constitution, which the giver cannot recall without consent or a paramount necessity. It is analogous to the recognition of the independence of the United States; a recognition which could not be constitutionally cancelled, though assailable by a war, dictated by the honor of the crown, and the necessities of the Empire. I do not question the Power of the British Parliament, but the Right to exercise it in the case before us. Power and Right, are terms which are not synonymous. Power expresses ability, and alike applies to the good, the bad, or the indifferent. Right expresses ability, but circumscribed by moral bounds. Herod had the Power to destroy all the male children in his kingdom, but he had not the Right to do it. Roman parents had an absolute Power over the lives of their children, but not the Right to murder them. It might, and no doubt would, be declared competent for the British Parliament to enact that we Canadians should, in the legislature, and out of it too, only speak French, as the most musical language of the world; or that we should all speak, and keep all public records, in English, as belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race; or that, in order to avoid scholastic and promote classical learning, we should all speak Latin; or that we should on occasional occasions lie on our backs, he only lawfully married by a minister of the Church of England, and in the Legislative Council always walk on all-fours, anything in a colonial act to the contrary notwithstanding. Assuredly we should think all this very unconstitutional! It would be a violation of those principles of liberty, which it is the object and duty of all governments to maintain. But if we have a right to speak and walk erect as men, we have a right to walk erect as Christians, with the harmless rights of Christians among our own churches, and with our own government of them. It is a strange doctrine, that any earthly act can lawfully prevail against reason and justice, against mankind and against Heaven.—Canute the Great enacted on the spot, hitherto shall the tide flow and no further: but the law of gravity superseded it.—And no truer legislation can be regarded as paramount to truth, though the sword may enforce it.—Lord North once said: "It's a strange right which the moment it is exercised becomes a wrong."—But Shakespeare better expresses the truth in nearly these words, "the exercise of a legal right may be a moral wrong."—Now the moral wrong may so preponderate, as to utterly invalidate the exercise of the legal right. Hence the Christian rule,—"judge ye whether you will rather obey God or man." We comprise about two millions of people—of Christians—and with the Bible in our hands as our eternal charter, we demand the rights and liberties it has vouchsafed to us, from a Legislator more Supreme than the mistresses of the world.—We ask that there may be no interference with our religious affairs, with our domestic churches, or with our ministers, or with

whatever is paid from us, for us, into the Treasury of the Most High.—We ask that the 3rd and 4th Vict. may be repealed. The 3rd & 4th Vict., cap. 78, is unconstitutional, because it substantially provides for the raising and appropriation of money without our consent. It is admitted that our money cannot be raised from us without our consent, and that when raised from us in carrying out any general commercial policy, it must be left at our disposal for our special appropriation. Import or export duties might be imposed to make our trade compatible with the general interests of the empire, of which we form a part; but the amount collected would go, not to the Imperial Treasury, not to a fund distributable by the Imperial authorities, but to the general Provincial Revenues, for disposal by the Provincial authorities for any or every purpose. And yet the rents, issues, and profits, of our leased reserves and a portion of every bushel of wheat gathered from them, form a fund which the British Government and Parliament may be said to have raised from us, the unequal apportionment of which they have dictated and desire to continue in spite of us.—Suppose the Derby administration having established its position, should return to protection—should require us as a protection to British agriculturists, to impose a duty at Quebec upon every bushel of wheat or barrel of flour exported to Great Britain; we should say if the people of the British Isles choose to eat dear bread, dearer by the amount of duty collected at Quebec, we may be sorry, but cannot help it. But assume further, that the amount so collected at Quebec, was directed by the Derby administration, to be at the disposal of the Lords of the Treasury, perhaps three-fourths to the Germans and Africans, and one-fourth to other settlers. We should be very urgent and very eloquent against it. Admitting the tax and its collection, we should claim the right of applying the money thus raised from us and of varying the appropriation as we please. And this is not more repulsive than three-fourths of the Clergy Reserves to the Churches of England and Scotland and one-fourth to the other Churches, and this fund too raised from us without our consent—appropriated without our consent and maintained against our consent. In like manner, suppose Great Britain should raise an annual revenue from the soil of Canada—from the sale of gypsum as a manure; or from the iron ore so abundantly diffused in our country; or from the copper, enriching the regions of Lake Superior; or from the pigments found in Lower Canada;—we might submit to the impost, to meet some imaginable imperial interests connected with those mineral productions, but we should show an utter repugnance to any assumption by the Derby administration, to appropriate the money raised from us, either to imperial interests or imperial favoritism. If you raise the money let us appropriate it in the way we judge right and equitable from time to time. We cannot have forgotten the time when the whole local and territorial revenue raised from us was consumed, no one knew how; and in all attempts to arrive at its real amount or to direct its useful appropriation, we were held in unconstitutional defiance. Now, in the case before us, these Reserves form a part of our national wealth and resources. They have been improved in value by the industry of our people and the progressive improvement of the country. From these Reserves a revenue, an ecclesiastical revenue, is raised, and we say the revenue so raised, just as much as if raised by a duty, or a tax, or a mere exaction, ought to be at the disposal of the people from whence it is so raised. The element from which the money is raised does not alter the principle. It might be from turnpike gates or from the Post Office, instead of our Reserves. It is, therefore, not consistent with our just constitutional expectations, or with the dear bought maxims of British policy and of Colonial rights, that the money from our Reserves, any more than from any other source, should be withheld from the power of the local Parliament, or that we should be forbidden to initiate any measure or to "alter, vary, or repeal" any existing appropriation in the way most consonant to public opinion. And what is the amount thus exacted from us for this forced ecclesiastical benevolence? He

(Dr. R.) did not know. If we were to estimate the past, present and future, it would amount to millions, varying with the prospective value of the landed estate. Let us take an estimate furnished in an excellent history of the Reserves published by Mr. Lindsay: "The funded capital, and the revenue arising therefrom, are every year rapidly increasing. When all the lands are sold, the capital fund would not be less than eight millions of dollars; yielding an annual revenue at six per cent. of \$480,000." These amounts are enough to endanger, year, corrupt every church in the country. All this is over and above the voluntary "benevolence" of the people to their churches—and the matter, therefore, becomes serious and important, not only in point of principle, but in point of amount and practical evil. He (Mr. Rolph), pleased with the remarks from the hon. member for the South Riding of York, had not been inattentive to his argument drawn from the assertion that the Reserves were not our property; and if not our property, the fund now raised could not be said to be raised upon an objectionable principle. Now waving the general law that every people derive in a new country their wealth from its natural resources, he (Mr. R.) reminded the hon. member of the terms of the constitutional act, by which we were empowered to "alter, vary or repeal" the clauses relating to the Clergy Reserves.—He (Mr. R.) had already read to the hon. member the invitation of Lord Glenelg to express that power to "abolish the Reserves," and to "vest" them in the Crown. By the constitutional act and by all British statesmen this property has been recognised as belonging to the country and disposable by its Parliament.—This act is further unconstitutional, as striking at the foundations of British liberty, as recorded in the imperishable memorial of our rights, in the petition and bill of rights, and our Magna Charta. By Magna Charta, every Briton is "protected in the free enjoyment of his life, his liberty, and his property, unmolested by his peers or the law of the land." By the bill of rights, "the levying of money for or to the use of the Crown, by pretence of prerogative, without grant of Parliament, for longer time or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted, is illegal." By the petition of rights, "no man can be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such like charge, without common consent by act of Parliament." But our benevolence to the churches is bestowed for us from our Reserves without the consent of Parliament, and against the voice of the people lifted up in honest unanimity and constitutional decision. We are, however, coolly told that the duty of our Parliament has been assumed by the British Parliament, and our future legislation merged in it. This was not the consent of the people or their Parliament, enforced by the charters of British liberty. These charters, written in the book of nature and in the Word of God, every Briton carries with him everywhere in the world; but the statutes at large he leaves behind.—"Life, liberty and property"—these are really the constituents of what Blackstone calls "natural liberty." Life, which the Creator has bestowed, and perhaps alone can properly take away. Liberty, which comprehends the free use of the active powers of body and mind. Property, which those active powers acquire as an essential of human happiness. As these gifts come from the same source, they are alike sacred against an arbitrary disposition; just as are the light and air of Heaven. An abridgment of these natural rights, is an abridgment of natural liberty; and if any abridgment of these rights can be made without the consent of the owner, right and liberty cease, and despotism begins. In the case before us, the consent of Canadians, in which they are represented in the Colonial Parliament, is superseded by the will of the British Parliament, in which they are not represented, or are misrepresented.—The case is only strengthened by the fact that the British Parliament had solemnly delegated the power to the Colonial Parliament. The 3 & 4 Vic. is therefore unconstitutional, as it respects the Canadian people, the foundations of natural liberty, and the faith of constitutional powers. Blackstone says:—
"If an unhabited country be discovered and planted by English subjects, all English laws then in being, which are the bright of

every subject, are immediately there in force. But this must be understood with very many and very great restrictions. Such colonies carry with them only so much of the English law as is applicable to their own situation, and the condition of an infant colony; such, for instance, as the general rules of inheritance and of protection from personal injuries. The artificial requirements and distinctions incident to the property of a great and commercial people, the laws of police and revenue (such especially as are enforced by penalties,) the mode of maintenance for the established clergy, the jurisdiction of spiritual courts, and a multitude of other provisions, are neither necessary nor convenient for them, and therefore are not in force.

Acting upon these broad and primitive views, the Puritans, upon landing at Plymouth, first offered up the incense of praise and thanksgiving for their safe arrival in the new world, and then in solemn convention declared the laws that should govern them. We may glean something from their times. The Corewans, originally a colony from Corinth, offended their metropolis; power by some unusual conduct in their public sacrifices; and this ecclesiastical displeasure, mixed up with other things, led to a war between them. Is our religion to like manner to be metropolized? Are our sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving to be made amenable to a distant civil authority? Are Canadian Christians to be subsidized, through their reserves, to sustain an ecclesiastical policy they disapprove, but which is imposed upon them? Again, the Corewans dispute who were sent to seek the alliance of the Athenians against Corinth, stated in answer to the objection that they were a colony of Corinth, that "a colony ought to respect the mother country as long as the latter deals justly and kindly by it; but if the colony be injured and wronged by the mother country, then the tie is broken, and they become alienated from each other, because, said the Corewans, *colonists are not sent out as subjects, but as free men, to have equal rights with those who remain at home.*" This shows the kind of relation, as understood by the Greeks, between the metropolis and its colonies. The colonies were, in fact, sovereign states, attached to the mother country by ties of sympathy and common descent, so long as those feelings were fostered by mutual good will, but no further. The Athenians, it is true, in the height of their power, exacted money from their own colonies as well as from the colonies of other people, and punished severely those who averred from their alliance, such as Naxos; but this was not in consequence of any original dominion as supposed to belong to the mother country over the colony. While, therefore, we freely acknowledge on the one hand that the British Parliament have the power to enact their pleasure; we declare, on the other hand, that all earthly power has its constitutional limits, and its moral boundaries; and we therefore, as a people with uplifted hands, give utterance to our imprecations against any interference with our religion; against the violation of the ancient British charters, the birthright of all, by taking the property of the public and of individuals, without the consent of their parliament, and making it their coercive gift or benevolence to any favored churches.

We therefore seek the repeal of this British Act, because Earl Grey has officially pledged it. We ask for it because the only colonial bills which were presented to the crown for its assent were disallowed. We ask for it because it was not left to that Canadian parliament in which, according to the noble secretaries of the Colonial Department, the initiation of such a measure could alone be constitutionally taken; we ask it because the British Act was at variance, and officially known to be at variance with the well understood, and often expressed wishes of the people; we ask its repeal because it was passed in direct contradiction to the official declarations and solemn assurances of several colonial secretaries; we ask it because the act was unconstitutional, and so declared by the avowed principles of Lord Glenelg, Lord John Russell, and the crown officers; we ask it because no law can be justified or tolerated which is illegitimate in its origin, and unground in its constitution, and indefensible in its antecedents. But

it is not enough to urge for its repeal on these grounds. The momentous question arises irresolubly in the mind, ought we to remain with our constitution mutilated and embarrassed? ought we to leave a transatlantic power to legislate upon subjects, which are to us, of paramount importance? are we to allow them to take the initiative upon any future occasion of illegal expediency, and deal out with an irresponsible hand a new ecclesiastical system or state church policy? Can Great Britain admittedly, or as Lord Glenelg would say, constitutionally be left in the possession and exercise of such a power? These are points upon which he (Mr. R.) would offer a few passing observations. The hon. member for Kent takes the lead in advocating a disregard of our constitutional position, and in urging us to pass a bill to be confirmed by the British Parliament. In the course of the debate he was asked what he would do, if the British Parliament refused to pass such a law, for its adoption and confirmation. To this question he betrayed his inevitable embarrassment, and being pressed for his ultimatum, it was obvious to the House how the hon. member hesitated and even stammered out his final and heroic resolution, to go and agitate England, Ireland and Scotland, and enlist the dissenters especially, to coerce the British Parliament to pass a law to make his bill and his religious views the law. The political heroism of the hon. member excited at the time a mirth, which would, perhaps, have scarcely been excusable under less humorous circumstances. Suppose the gallant member should succeed in carrying through both houses a bill, that he should proceed with it in gallant style, armed with the largest saddlebags containing ready-made advertisements from the office of the Globe, and all mounted upon a suitable Rosinante for a political pilgrimage through the British Isles. Suppose the gallant member, who has volunteered this course and his services, should alight as a spiritual Quixote in Ireland, open his saddlebags and commence his agitation—and, Sir, he is away as fast or faster than he (Mr. Rolph) had placed him there—at his very first meeting, conveyed by his well distributed advertisements, he would have no hearers, but plenty of observers, to hint the prudence of his not obtruding himself from Canada upon the principles and foundation of the established church of Ireland; and the pious catholics in their simplicity would ask, "has this generous Quixote come from Canada to agitate us out of the payment of Roman Catholic tithes to Protestant churches?" and by this time the Irish orangemen would be at his heels, with such reasonable suggestions as to hurry him across (the member for Kingston said "the channel")—Yes the channel—and the hon. member is in England! The police keep a suspicious eye upon all his eccentric movements; the high church party and Cardinal Wiseman are all alive at the visit of the great Canadian agitator, and plant thorns throughout his patriotic path; and taking his promised refuge in the dissenters, they would tell him plainly that "only enjoying toleration themselves, they are not in a position to interfere between the British and Canadian Parliament, which Canadian Parliament has its own powers, its own redress—go, put your own shoulder to the wheel." Passing by Scotland on his way to Canada he would return with the sober and simple truth, that we would get the power first and legislate afterwards. To agitate the people of Great Britain and Ireland to enforce in their Parliament the passing of a bill with religious provisions upon which discord rather than concord must prevail, is indeed, Quixotic. But all England, Ireland and Scotland will respond to our appeal for the restoration of our rightful constitutional power; instead of being disunited by conflicting religious views, they will be united in the recognition of the justice of our appeal, and adjudge us our rights, in the language of Earl Grey,—language worthy of a British nobleman, a constitutional statesman, and a patriotic minister,—language which he, (Mr. Rolph) had already read to the House, and would not item recanvass of time read again, worthy as it was of being often read and carefully treasured up.—What ground have we to suppose that such a system of agitation, or any kind of agitation, would bring the British Parliament, or British

nation, to harmonise their ecclesiastical views with ours? Without disrespect to Great Britain we may appeal to the history of the past, to bear testimony to the danger of leaving distant and unrepresented interests to any others than the parties interested. If we throw our religious legislation into the British House of Commons and House of Lords, can we, as reasonable beings, expect them, so to direct themselves of religious prepossessions, as to do better or more liberally for us than for themselves? The whole tendency of legislation in England from the days of "Good Queen Bess," has been towards pains and penalties, towards fine, imprisonment, and even transportation for non-conformity. And although of late, the corporation and test acts have been modified, yet the existing contest about rights and interests, carried on between the established and dissenting churches and their respective adherents (putting Cardinal Wiseman out of the question) are enough to negative the proposition to attain our religious rights rather by agitation among religious dissentients abroad, than by self reliance in our own institutions. The history of our Rectories, their origin, the means used for their erection, and their maintenance for years upon an imaginary foundation, and the existing contest for their abolition, convey admonitions full of interest and concern. Is not this alone an abundant warning to avoid foreign and maintain domestic legislation upon religious affairs? The member for Kent had better stay at home. — But even in our own times we see upon a fearful scale, the power of a Parliament directed in the very way of which we complain, and productive of evils which our posterity may have to feel. He (Mr. Rolph) alluded to Ireland. The Irish Parliament is extinct; and the religious rights of Ireland are guarded at Westminster. The Irish Clergy Reserves, (he meant the tithes) are, as in the case with our Reserves, unequally distributed. A portion of these Irish Reserves, bearing the proportion of the Catholics to the Protestants, is paid by the Catholics to the Protestants. The very earth there seems blighted by being made to bear its unholy tribute to ecclesiastical favouritism and church oppression. Amidst the conflict of parties, the change of circumstances and the shifting of imperial ministers, what right have we to presume that, in irresponsible hands, our ecclesiastical legislation is safer than the Irish? There should be no legislation direct or indirect upon our Clergy Reserves, or through them upon our churches, upon our ministers, or upon our religion, or upon its purity, than what begins with our own people and is ended and consummated by the powers of our own constitution. The very spirit of accommodation, which the British Government has displayed in religious matters, gives us little to hope from any continuous policy, which could be forever unexceptionable. Take a lesson from the politico ecclesiastical expediency in the protection, countenance and aid afforded governmentally in India to the Idol JUGGERNAUT! Juggernaut! who occupies with his priests 60 acres of consecrated ground! Ground putrid with the remains of pilgrims and of devotees crushed beneath his satanic wheels! To all this and to other idolatry, British aid, British tax-gatherers and British military music are made tributary. To the honor of some British General whom now he (Mr. Rolph) forgot, the British bands of music were relieved from these performances in pagan temples and at idolatrous rites. But such is the versatility of opinion and the fluctuation of power, that a man less scrupulous than his predecessor; a man perhaps educated in the tactics of colonial government and who had ministered freely against civil and religious rights elsewhere, countermanded the righteous ordinance of his predecessor, and again made a band of christian musicians subservient to the idolatrous performances of heathen pageants. Legislation upon our Reserves and our churches, and their ministers, is better in our own than in irresponsible hands. Imperial Religious Legislation, then, for England, for Ireland, for Scotland, or for the Empire, has failed for any good, while it has been productive of evil at home and abroad. It so far did good abroad, that the dissensions and animosities generated by artificial distinction and sectarian favoritism, drove the Puritans from their homes to America, whither they carried an influence which is not

only acknowledged and displayed in the present generation, but is evidently destined to transmit its salutary results to future times. — On the other hand, through the same channel of importation, we have had too much reason to know that intolerance with all its warring elements, has troubled us with sectarian jealousy, with strife for ecclesiastical supremacy, and with organizations detrimental to the peace and sometimes destructive to the lives of our citizens. Such are the poisonous fruits of legislation on religious affairs; such the disorders which multiply and extend from it far and wide; somewhat like those noxious weeds with winged seeds, which are wafted by every wind wheresoever it blows. It is wise, therefore, to avoid distant legislation on our affairs, when the past conveys a warning that such legislation is safer in our own hands. — Every nation in Europe has tried its daring hand in the same way. Every nation has striven to erect a tower of Babel; has striven to mould itself into a theocracy, to rule both the affairs of this world and of the next. But they have all, through a series of centuries, signally failed. Instructed by this failure, it behoves us to draw our religious affairs within the precincts of our own country, and to avoid those evils which have grown to such fearful magnitude in Europe, as to menace its overthrow and desolation, and to drive, with desperation, a suffering population by thousands upon thousands, as fugitives, to our shores. From whatever quarter of the world the fugitives may come, he (Mr. Rolph) joined in giving them a hearty welcome. Let Canada be emphatically the emigrant's home. Let us combine to make it worthy of the choicest nations. If our fellow citizens of the world are unhappy at home, here let us prepare for them a country abounding with all the elements for their redemption. If idle, we can give them abundance of remunerative work, in the pursuits of agriculture, or the alginate improvements of a free and enterprising people. If they hunger, we have a superabundance of food and ways to earn it. If they thirst, we open to them rivers unnumbered in magnificence, and unrivalled in purity. If they want the earth to till and luxuriate upon, the Queen opens to them her wide domain. If they aspire to political rights, we offer them a liberty, which we desire to preserve pure and ample, and which we are now slow to enlarge. If they pause and chill at the prospect of expatriation, (who can wonder at it?) we cheer them with a people embracing the nations of the earth. But this is not all. This, alone, is not enough. There is another recess of the heart to be reached. There is another wound of continental hearts to be healed. In almost every portion of the old world, we find the most fearful religious animosities and awful persecutions. From these scenes the people fly. They leave religious everywhere planted with the willow, and shrouded with mental darkness. Cutting asunder the ties of country, of friends, and relations, and doing violence to all the endearing associations of life, they fly from religious despotism with its frightful results, and seek an asylum here in the new world. Let us, however, see that it is *new*, that it is not an exchange of the religious paternity of Austria for that of Sir John Pakington. As they are religiously aggrieved, we must display to them a community where all Christians are free and equal, or, God granting it, shall be so; a land where the fluctuating discretion of a political minister shall not be a substitute for the merely worse despotism of Europe; where the exchange shall not be merely in *degrees*, but in *kind*; where neither the ecclesiastical empire of Downing Street, nor the usurpations of even our own legislature shall invade the Theocracy of the Christian Empire. He had transiently spoken of the mischiefs from legislation on religious affairs in England and Ireland and Europe. It may not be amiss for us to cast a glance on the brief history of our own Canada, and allude to the imported evils under which we have labored. Imported from home we have been afflicted with strife in attempts to annihilate the unchristian contest among christian ministers and churches about the Clergy Reserves; with strife to secure that religious equality which is the birth-right of a people, and an indispensable ingredient of national peace and individual happiness. — It was

not without a protracted struggle that a majority of the country, designated as dissenters, could easily hold a church, or a burial ground, or vindicate its peaceful occupancy by living worshippers or by the ashes of the dead. Our ecclesiastical history, however, has been furnished by events too recent to need recapitulation to revive our recollections, awaken our caution, or enforce our duty. We have had struggles here. They would be harder struggles in London.—The hon. member for Kent had better stay at home.

"Taxation without our consent" is, and ever will be an exciting topic; it is vulgarly called, "the argumentum ad pocketum." But in all ages and in all countries, every people have been exquisitely alive to these rights of conscience, to those safeguards to independent faith, and to those securities, whether direct or indirect, bearing upon man's eternal relations, without which, as a religious and immortal being, he becomes liable to religious despotism or spiritual slavery. The control of our religious system, admitting it to be controlled at all, is far more important than the control of our monetary system. A nation enlightened by knowledge, human and divine, ever must be, and ever will be, free. But the moment the letters are put upon the better part of man, and those moral powers are enfeebled, upon which his exaltation depends, he becomes fearfully endangered. He must then either submit to grope in the darkness or languish in the degeneracy of the State; or, if all the noble powers within heave against the direful incubus, he must waste for relief through the blood, the carnage, and the revolutions, which have involved all Europe in the past, and which are impending over its future destiny, and hope for regeneration. This, it will be said, is not exactly our political or religious condition. We may well rejoice at it. But it is the very degree of light and knowledge and freedom we possess, which enables and disposes us to regard with concern, that element of evil, which we now desire to be swept away. We must not simply regard the amount, the number or seeming magnitude of a constitutional disability; but we must regard the principle violated, the security that principle affords, and the evils to which its abrogation may give birth. Without our wonted precaution against fire, a spark despised has kindled a devastating flame. It is the extinguishment of the spark, which gives the security.—Hampton could well afford to pay the 20s. demanded; but had he and others paid what was demanded, at the time demanded, and upon the principle demanded, they would have been slaves; and that slavery might have descended to us. And whatever a political casuistry may say, to soothe the present and beguile the future, he (Mr. Rolph) was not prepared to say what might not be the religious condition of this or some coming generation, if this piece of heaven is allowed to work, and if our legislation upon these religious questions is to be merged in the distant, absorbing, changing and uncontrollable transatlantic power. They only ask, to be sure, for a little supremacy in a small class of cases. No the axe only asked for wood enough to complete its symmetry and handle; but so possessed, it became the small but efficient instrument for prostrating the finest forests.—The people of England, and most emphatically the people of Scotland, have been taught, by history and experience, the importance, the supreme importance, of maintaining their constitutional ascendancy in their own religious and ecclesiastical affairs. We only ask them with their usual generosity and justice, to sympathize with our corresponding position, rights, and anxieties. It is just one of those powers not to be given or withheld by an arithmetical rule. It is a right which equally affects and interests a few and a multitude; a little church and a large one; the humblest chapel and the most magnificent cathedral; a Solomon's Temple and the hermit's shade; Great Britain and Ireland, and progressive Canada. It is the right which accountable beings in a community claim to guard against undue power from abroad over religious interests of their country, or of any individual in it. The encroachment of religious dissension upon any people for another, or by any Government for people, transcends the sphere of civil and commercial concerns, and intrudes upon a domain where man is forbidden to reign; a region which he cannot occupy without usurpation, or govern without impurity. We have

good ground, therefore, to claim for ourselves the same right to vindicate and preserve our religious affairs in Canada, as the people enjoy in England and Scotland. The same privileges which belong to their larger parliament, appertain to our own, though to some it may seem comparatively small. Her Majesty is said to have the smallest watch in the world. It may be in a brooch; he believed it is in the facing of a ring—perhaps worn on the hand that shall record our liberation from our constitutional disability. This tiny watch, however, has the same wheels, though so small, and the same component parts as are seen so much larger and more conspicuous in the magnificent chronometer of St. Paul's in London, or of St. Peter's in Rome. And the smaller Canadian Parliament needs the moving powers corresponding to those in the Parent Parliament; that we may keep as good political time in Quebec as Britons do in London; that we may safely determine our longitude in the sea of Canadian politics; that our pendulum may properly vibrate between the safe limits of civil and religious liberty. The birds of the air have nests, and the princes of the earth have palaces; but the Lawgiver has bestowed upon both the very same physical laws,—laws which are equally necessary to each for its construction and its maintenance. The air we breathe is as necessary for the moth as for the mammoth; for the insect as for man. And without an atmosphere with those vivifying elements of civil and religious liberty, in which the people of Great Britain exult and breathe and live, our little community cannot politically exist, or exist, must languish. It has been poetically said, the poor black beetle which we tread upon, feels a pang as great as when a giant dies. And Canadians would mourn as much over the funeral obsequies of the Canadian Parliament, as Britons could over the like fate of its more gorgeous parent. We, therefore, call upon the people of England, Ireland and Scotland in their united Parliament, to heal the wound our Constitution has received—to remove the unjust and painful abridgment of our legislative functions—to feel a national pride in elevating instead of depressing, in enlarging, instead of contracting, the political institutions of their fellow countrymen in Canada. Let us remind them by the very draft we now make upon them, that, however some may superciliously regard us as a shrub, we bear a fruit not found on many giant trees; that we have sprung from the roots of the rose, the shamrock and the thistle; that while we are proud of our origin, they may be well proud of their offspring; and that we remove them from us give us the same necessary for our civilization and material development in this American soil and under American sunshine. It is sometimes cavalierly said, we want nationality. The Scotch have their St. Andrew's Day, the English their St. George's Day, and the Irish their St. Patrick's Day. But, during forty years, he had not known a corresponding jubilee for the national character and people of Canada. The late American colonies have their jubilee of the 4th July, coeval with their emancipation from an erring and unhappy policy. And the magna charta, announced by Simcoe and further sanctioned by the illustrious Durham, ought to be enough to elevate the feelings, cheer the prospects, and animate the nationality of Canadians. But against the letter and spirit of this magna charta, we are still troubled with disabilities calculated to lower the self-respect and depress the aspiring elements of Canadian character. It seems as if we might be again bound hand and foot by cord-like restrictions on our domestic policy. We can be allowed to legislate freely and unrestrictedly on the clergy reserves! We cannot be unceremoniously disappointed of Imperial pledges and guarantees, as sacred as those national treaties which cannot be repudiated without dishonouring international law and incurring the censure of the civilized world. It is these fetters on our institutions; it is these dampers upon our energies, even when directed to the all-absorbing subjects of internal improvement and of civil and religious rights, which cause our colonial abasement and our colonial indignities. We cannot have nationality, we cannot stand up in the attitude and with the spirit and with the action of colonial manhood, under these depressing agencies and these constitutional inferiorities. Never can we do so till that situation

12

is removed which intervenes between us and the parent state; an obstruction which clouds our operations to-day and afflicts a whole people with a constitutional eclipse. Never can we do so, till we have fully and fairly what *Times* announced in the ever-memorable words—"I have brought you, not a mutilated Constitution, but a Constitution which has stood the test of experience, and is the very image and transcript of that of Great Britain." Any attempt on the part of Great Britain to cripple our Legislature or fetter it in its domestic legislation, is founded on an unwise policy. Such a mutilated condition is always attended with pain and disease; but happily with unceasing efforts under a political *vis medicatrix* nature, to attain a sound, a perfect and healthful state. Such a Legislature is, like an individual, ever with an eye upon the defect, mortified by its existence, enshrined by its notoriety, and humbled by humiliating comparisons. There is in infant nations, as in infant individuals, an aspiration to manhood. This uneasiness under restraint arises and increases under those causes which develop intelligence and power. And it is this very state, with its advancing invigoration and consciousness of power, which kindles that spirit of progress and that fire of ambition towards maturity in age and action, which alike animate and impel individuals and nations. Great Britain cannot but see that we are thus rapidly growing in all the elements of national strength, and therefore, seek from her a corresponding concession of national attributes. As children we went to church with our parents; as men we determine our own religious faith and establish our own ecclesiastical relations. Most assuredly Great Britain, because she is great, will not object to it. Canadians, as children, at first crept, and we crept with them. But in the progress of our growth, we became able to walk, and in time to run. Emboldened by the rapid acquisition of physical strength and youthful enterprise, we began to climb—to climb, often, in a venturesome way, till a few failures, a few tumbles, gave us no exertion, gave us buoyancy under disappointment and experience for every renewed attempt. We have left our old fashioned canoes and Durham boats, and boast of ships and steamboats that would, on the whole, bear comparison to those on the Thames, the Shannon or the Clyde. Impatient among the aspirants to the civilization and improvements of 1852, we have in being or in progress, canals and railroads, ministering to the convenience and luxuries of a growing people; a people whose commerce is worthy the consideration of mighty nations. And we share by the power of sending far and wide over this great continent our electric messages; and we hope by a submarine telegraph soon to hold converse with our transatlantic friends. We became of sufficient age to enter the Crystal Palace, and conspicuous among the productions of all the civilized nations of the earth, were the Canadian exhibitions in the wide world's fair, and our noble friend stands here to-night, who carried in wheat, for our colonial empire the colonial prize. All these happy realities from the eventful past and brilliant expectations of the future, we are happy to associate with Great Britain's Crown. But surely this very condition bespeaks the consideration due the constitution of the country—that it should not be pitifully fettered or ignominiously reduced—that we should not have abstracted from us the right of solely judging of our religious faith and ecclesiastical relations—that while we are empowered to dispose of the wild lands generally, we shall not be interdicted in the appropriation of that portion of them which are reserved for ecclesiastical uses.—It is desirable that this concession should extend in the most unrestricted sense, to all our local affairs. In debate in the British Commons, Sir J. Pakington declared that his duties were sometimes *overwhelming*. He might, therefore, very properly relieve himself of all our ecclesiastical and other local affairs. Even allowing that there are some larger objects visible in the distance, by Downing Street, there are within every remote province innumerable matters regulating the minute affinities in social religious relations, which no distant eye can see. A political microscope can be applied only to objects near and at home. The central gravitation of Downing Street is not

sailed to control those more minute and intimate changes which more properly appertain to a local political chemistry. The central power may hold in systemic union the numerous elements of the general empire, and keep them within their appointed areas, and within the limits of their constitutional orbits; but that central power would be unavailingly expended upon the subtilty of molecular action, upon the adjustment of those elective attractions, which variously predominate in different parts of the widespread whole. Let England glory in the successful direction of her mighty energies in maintaining the integrity of the Empire, while each integral part is allowed to be the theatre for the display of its own intimate and appropriate powers. Let us, if any one does, attend to our own reserves, to our own churches and their vital condition, as affected favourably or otherwise by the monies raised from us and distributed among them.—Is thus seeking the restoration of our abstracted right, we follow the footsteps of the parent state. To Englishmen we appeal to favour us in an advancement like their own; that we may grow like them, not only in population, commerce and wealth, but also in those political attributes which render them pre-eminent among the nations of the earth. We appeal to Irishmen, that they may remember the days of their infancy, when they could originate no bill, take the initiative in no measure which had not emanated from the crown and received its sanction; when they were placed in their general legislation, as we are in the Clergy Reserve question, with a power merely to accept or reject such bills as might be proposed or modified by the British government. As they have from their proximity become engrafted into the Parent Parliament, surely they will generously aid us at a distance to maintain our integrity, exalt our usefulness and mature our powers. We appeal to Scotchmen, that they may remember the Lords of the Articles, appointed by the Crown, and holding the power of really legislating for the Scotch Parliament; that they may remember their subordinate position as a people from the abolition of their Legislative Star Chamber, till the memorable year 1832, when Scotland emerged from her humble position, received a co-extensive franchise with the sister Isle, and moved *pari passu* with the knights of the English shires. And surely this bright epoch in Scotch history, is so recent to find the devout gratitude of the nation exhausted, or its sympathy, for a kindred and emerging power, lost in its own elevation. We appeal to the claims presented by the agricultural, commercial, and general prosperity of the country. This prosperity is ascribed to constitutional causes by no less authority than Lord John Russell; who, not in a casual or even parliamentary speech, but in a cool and deliberate address to his electors, directs their attention, even as an example, to the happy and enviable condition of progressive Canada; and emphatically ascribes it to the wisdom and ability with which constitutional government has been carried out among us.—But let us not forget that we have not to boast of this achievement merely by ourselves; certainly not without sharing the honor and glory with one of the most distinguished British statesmen of the day; a statesman more impetioned in his eloquence than Pitt, and not less sagacious than Canning, or less polished than Peel; a statesman who comprehends and respects constitutional liberty in all its bearings, and can wield with surpassing wisdom and success the sceptre of free government; one who can steer amidst difficulties that would give a crimson dye to any European throne; and who has bound up wounds with such princely magnanimity and patriotism, as not to leave even a scar behind. Looking, therefore, at the whole question in its rise and progress and present position, and regarding the pretensions of a deserving, industrious, and loyal people, he felt the justice of our constitutional appeal; an appeal for the restoration of our lost power and abstracted right to initiate and regulate effectually upon the Clergy Reserves, and all vital questions inseparable from their appropriation. Such was the liberty which, as a Canadian, he made bold to ask; such was the liberty which, as an Englishman, he would be proud to give. And as a step, he hoped successful step, towards it, he supported the prudent and truth-telling address in their hands.